

Remarks

Claims 1, 12 and 22 are amended herein. Claims 1-25 remain pending in the Application.

Rejection under 102(e)

Claims 1-25

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-25 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Downs et al. (6748439). Applicant has reviewed Downs et al. and respectfully states that Downs et al. do not anticipate the present invention for the following rationale.

Applicant respectfully states that Claim 1 includes the features "an application service provider server register configured to maintain current application service provider server information for at least one outside application server providing said application services associated with a plurality of application services requested by said computing device". One example of a service provider application is a request for an outside application service regarding video editing, content edition and enhancement. Another example is a request for an outside application service regarding audio editing, copying and production. That is, the request for application services is a request for an application service provider to perform a service based on the application requested. These features are clearly shown throughout the specification including Figure 6 and Table A and paragraphs [0003], [0028], [0029], [0037], [0042] and [0046].

Applicant respectfully disagrees that Downs et al. anticipates the features of Claim 1. Applicant understands Downs et al. to teach a method for allocating unused resources to a network for utilization. That is, Applicant understands Downs et al. to teach the resource requester to be a client that needs computing or processing resources for a task, the resource allocator to be a server that

assigns a particular task to one of a plurality of resource providers, and the resource providers are computer systems with resources (e.g., processing power) that the resource provider is willing to sell to clients, such as the resource allocator and the resource requesters.

Therefore, Applicant does not understand Downs et al. to teach any application service routing based on the unique application service requested and the capabilities of a service provider to perform the service. Furthermore, Applicant understands Downs et al. (in the background) to teach away from a client sending a job to an outside source that will process the job. Moreover, Applicant understands Downs et al. to teach that the features of Claim 1 are costly and wasteful of time since the client must come to an agreement with an outside vendor over price and quality of service and physically transfer the job to that vendor. Moreover, the vendor, who is typically remote physically from the client, must process the job and physically return the results back to the client.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Downs et al. does not anticipate the present claimed invention as recited in Claim 1, and as such, Claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

With respect to Claim 12, Applicant respectfully states that Claim 12 includes the features "an application service provider server register configured to maintain current application service provider server information, said register based on the qualifying of said outside server's parameters." One example of an application provider application is a request for an outside application service regarding video editing, content edition and enhancement. Another example is a request for an outside application service regarding audio editing, copying and production. That is, the request for application services is a request for an application service provider to perform a service based on the application requested. These features are clearly shown throughout the specification

including Figure 6 and Table A and paragraphs [0003], [0028], [0029], [0037], [0042] and [0046].

Applicant respectfully disagrees that Downs et al. anticipates the features of Claim 12. Applicant does not understand Downs et al. to teach any application service routing based on the unique application service requested and the capabilities of a service provider to perform the service, or a register of such service providing servers. Furthermore, Applicant understands Downs et al. (in the background) to teach away from a client sending a job to an outside source that will process the job. Moreover, Applicant understands Downs et al. to teach that the features of Claim 12 are costly and wasteful of time since the client must come to an agreement with an outside vendor over price and quality of service and physically transfer the job to that vendor. Moreover, the vendor, who is typically remote physically from the client, must process the job and physically return the results back to the client.

Applicant respectfully states that Claim 12 also includes the features "a parameter reviewer for reviewing and qualifying the adequacy of an outside server's parameters to qualify the adequacy of the submitted parameters and a monitoring thread for monitoring whether the outside application server is satisfying the client requests." Support for these features can be found throughout the Specification including paragraphs [0003], [0028], [0029], [0037], [0042] and [0046]. Applicant respectfully states that Downs et al. does not disclose those features for an outside server's parameters.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Downs et al. does not anticipate the present claimed invention as recited in Claim 12, and as such, Claim 12 is in condition for allowance.

service providers that offer a service that is responsive to said client request." This is supported throughout the Specification and Figures including paragraph [0028]. Applicant respectfully states that Downs et al. does not disclose this feature.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Downs et al. does not anticipate the present claimed invention as recited in Claim 22, and as such, Claim 22 is in condition for allowance.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Downs et al. does not anticipate the present claimed invention as recited in Claims 1, 12 and 22, and as such, Claims 1, 12 and 22 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully submits that Downs et al. does not anticipate the present claimed invention as recited in Claims 2-11 which are dependent on an allowable Independent Claim 1, Claims 13-21 which are dependent on an allowable Independent Claim 12 and Claims 23-25 which are dependent on an allowable Independent Claim 22, and that Claims 2-11, 13-21 and 23-25 recite further features of the present claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that Claims 2-11, 13-21 and 23-25 are allowable as pending from allowable base Claims.

With respect to Claim 22, Applicant respectfully states that Claim 22 includes the features “receiving a client request for an application service to be performed by an application server over an established network connection; analyzing the client request to determine the type of application service that is requested; developing a qualified application service provider register, said register comprising qualified application service providers along with the parameters of the service provider servers.” One example of an outside service provider application is a request for application service regarding video editing, content edition and enhancement. Another example is a request for an outside application service regarding audio editing, copying and production. That is, the request for application services is a request for an application service provider to perform a service based on the application requested. These features are clearly shown throughout the specification including Figure 6 and Table A and paragraphs [0003], [0029], [0037], [0042] and [0046].

Applicant respectfully disagrees that Downs et al. anticipates the features of Claim 22. Applicant does not understand Downs et al. to teach any application service routing based on the unique application service requested and the capabilities of a service provider to perform the service, or to develop a register of such service providing servers. Furthermore, Applicant understands Downs et al. (in the background) to teach away from a client sending a job to an outside source that will process the job. Moreover, Applicant understands Downs et al. to teach that the features of Claim 22 are costly and wasteful of time since the client must come to an agreement with an outside vendor over price and quality of service and physically transfer the job to that vendor. Moreover, the vendor, who is typically remote physically from the client, must process the job and physically return the results back to the client.

In addition, Claim 22 includes the feature “providing a graphical user interface for providing a choice to a user among a number of said application

Conclusion

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of Claims 1-25.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,
Wagner, Murabito & Hao LLP

Date: 6/28/05



John P. Wagner, Jr.
Reg. No. 35,398

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060